

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-25, 27-29, 31-42, 44-49, 51-62 and 64-66 are pending. The subject matter of claims 15, 26, 30, 43, 50 and 63 have been incorporated into independent claims 1, 23, 27, 31, 47 and 51 respectively and the former group of claims canceled. Each of claims 16, 44, 46, 64 and 66 has also been amended so as not to depend from a canceled claim.

As now amended, each of the independent claims recites the generation of two distinct items: (i) a clustering result and (ii) a clustering result summary table, and further recites that these items are output together. U.S. patent 6,385,602 to *Tso et al.*, upon which claims 1, 15-17, 22, 23, 26, 27 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), does not disclose nor teach the generation of both of these items, nor the output of them together. Figs. 3A-3C illustrate the presentation of only the clustered search results; no summary is generated nor output.

None of the other applied references offset this deficiency in *Tso et al.* U.S. patent 6,425,282 to *Mukherjea et al.* is used in combination with *Tso et al.* to reject claims 7, 13, 31, 32, 41, 43-45, 47-48, 50-52, 61 and 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In the query refinement process of *Mukherjea et al.*, the search results may be clustered on the basis of text, image or URL, but such process does not include the generation of two distinct items: a clustering result and a clustering result summary table, nor the outputting of both of these items together.

In practice, the number of clusters may be quite high, e.g., several tens to several hundreds. Without a summary table, the user must view all clustering results to search for desired information. Simply presenting the clustering results leaves the user with a tedious job of finding the desired information. In contrast, with applicants' claimed invention, which includes both the clustering results and a summary table thereof, the user can glance at the cluster names of the summary table to see what clusters are contained in the clustering results, and which cluster possibly includes information desired by the user. See, e.g., Figs. 16 and 17 of applicants' application and corresponding descriptions in the

specification. These advantages, which flow directly from the claimed arrangement of generating not only the clustering result but also a summary table thereof and outputting them together, are also not taught by the applied references.

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, it is believed that this Amendment After Final Rejection places this application in condition for allowance without raising new issues. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that any issue remains outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at (408) 952-6126 in an effort to resolve any such issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael T. Gabrik
Michael T. Gabrik
Registration No. 32,896

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Customer No. 20178
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: December 3, 2003